



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the ratification of the treaty with Spain, have been a usurpation of the powers of Congress. This is based on the assumption that the termination of the formal war with Spain necessarily put an end to the war power of the President, under which, it is admitted, such legislation would have been legal. This assumption will, of course, be disputed by those who hold that the President governs in newly acquired territory by virtue of his war power until such time as Congress, by legislating for the territory, introduces civil government. The Spooner amendment to the Army Bill, vesting all governmental power in the Philippines in the President and his appointees, is dismissed as "a halting measure of doubtful legality," the reason being, apparently, that "Congress may not delegate legislative power to the President." That another view may be taken I have attempted to show in a previous number of this QUARTERLY (March, 1901).

Under the title, "The Alienation of the Philippines," Mr. Randolph in chapter five leaves the field of law for that of policy, and expresses the view that "the annexation of the Philippines is not a cross to be borne, but a blunder to be retrieved." He would have the United States withdraw its sovereignty from the islands and undertake a protectorate over them, and indicates in a general way what, in his opinion, the relations between our government and that of the future Philippine state should be.

Some twenty pages at the close of the book are devoted to a series of interesting "Observations on the Status of Cuba." The views advanced will doubtless in the main be acquiesced in by all publicists, and do not demand detailed statement here. An appendix contains the text of the joint resolution of Congress in regard to Cuba, the declaration of war, the protocol, the treaty of peace, and a few documents illustrative of some of the methods by which other nations have established protectorates of one form or another.

WALTER WHEELER COOK.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.

Reflections on the Origin and Destiny of Imperial Britain. By

J. A. CRAMB. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1900.

—315 pp.

This work by Professor Cramb, of Queen's College, London, constitutes "part of the more theoretic sections of a larger work, *The Origins of Imperial Britain.*" It is, therefore, what Emerson would call "transcendental politics." Possibly this may account for the fact that it promises much more than the results warrant.

It is, indeed, an irritating and disappointing book, which begins everywhere and ends nowhere, and is written in a style verging on the sophomoric. Some of these defects, however, may be due to the form and the evident haste of composition. It embraces seven lectures, bearing date from May 8 to July 10, 1900. If the author is a fair criterion, the English people must have been utterly shaken out of their characteristic imperturbability; for he certainly takes himself, his subject and the Boer war with the utmost seriousness. Were England contending in arms against all Europe at once, he could not strike a more heroic tone—nor make a more lavish use of capitalized adjectives and exclamation points. His encomiums of the “death-defying valor” of the British troops appeal irresistibly to the reader’s sense of humor, when he remembers their extreme readiness to surrender and the absurd disparity of forces.

Nevertheless, the book has some meat. Its scope will appear from the lecture headings: I, “What is Imperialism?”; II, “The Development of the Political Ideal”; III, “The Development of the Religious Ideal”; IV, “The War in South Africa”; V, “What is War?”; VI, “The Vicissitudes of States and Empires”; VII, “The Destiny of Imperial Britain and the Destiny of Man.” The view-point, while not entirely consistent throughout, is in the main that of the organic school. In fact, the organic theory is very skillfully brought to bear against the prevalent practice of judging international relations and actions by the same standard as those of individuals, the contention being that such identity of standards can be assumed only in case a nation is merely a collection of individuals, which the organic theory expressly denies. For example, the individual is bidden to prefer another to himself; but there can be no such law for nations. “In the faith that it and it alone can perform the fate-appointed task, dwells the virtue of every imperial race.”

By “Imperial Britain,” however, the author does not mean the British Empire, but rather “the informing spirit, the unseen force from within the race itself.” The book is thus essentially a study, not in history, but in mass-psychology historically considered. Concerning the origin of this “informing spirit,” he says:

In the history of every conscious organism, a race, a state, or an individual, there is a certain moment when the unconscious desire, purpose or ideal passes into the conscious. Life’s end is then manifest. . . . In the England of the seventeenth century, the conscious deliberate resolve to be

itself master of its fate takes complete possession of the nation. . . . Another ideal . . . has slowly advanced . . . the ideal of Imperial Britain . . . an empire resting not on violence but on justice and freedom.

This new ideal originated, the author believes, in the humiliations of the fifteenth century, which were for medieval England "what Syracuse was for Athens and Cannæ for Rome." Applying the law of tragic Katharsis to history, he declares that "the ἐνέργεια τῆς ψυχῆς . . . the spring of political wisdom, the foundation of the greatness of a state . . . is the immortal energy which arises within the consciousness of a nation, or in the soul of an individual, as the result of that hour of insight, of pity, of anguish, of contrition." It was this ideal which worked itself out alike in constitutional government and religious toleration; which spoke in Burke's impeachment of Warren Hastings and in Chatham's defense of the American Colonies; which inspired Wilberforce, Canning and the long line of English Liberals.

Imperialism is thus taken to mean Liberalism. The fundamental thesis of the book is contained in the definition: "Imperialism is patriotism transfigured by a light from the aspirations of universal humanity." The preceding empires of Europe were wrecked by the Roman ideal of power or, at most, of justice. But this new imperialism, starting from and based on freedom, is neither Hellenic nor Roman, but essentially British. It is in behalf of this ideal of imperialism, he maintains, that England has gone to war in South Africa. But while this new imperialism overrides the bounds of nationality in the name of humanity, it is not cosmopolitanism, which is well defined as "an attitude of mind purely negative, characteristic of protected nationalities and of decayed races." Ireland is "England's inheritance from the days of her blindness . . . when as yet she knew not the path of empire, the path of her peace." And of the proposal to allow independence to the Boer states, he says: "It is not the narrowed bounds we have to fear: it is the judgment of the dead, the despair of the living, of the inarticulate millions who have trusted to us; it is the arraigning eyes of the unborn. Who can confront this unappalled?"

Certainly, if the Boer war is to be justified, this is the only line of reasoning that will do it. But as to whether the author has made out his case, opinions will differ.

EDWARD VAN DYKE ROBINSON.

ST. PAUL, MINN.